

Specifically, H.R. 1 builds on the 1994 authorization, focusing on what will be taught and what should be learned at the State and local levels, and it asks schools to demonstrate their ability to drive student results by measuring how well or poorly students perform from one year to the next in reading and math.

Although the bill is careful to preserve a State's ability to design or select its own standards and assessments, the data required by H.R. 1 will help parents, teachers, and other school personnel intervene as soon as a student begins to falter, not after several years of failure.

This is essential. As Lisa Graham Keegan, superintendent of Arizona Public Schools, testified before my subcommittee, these tests are not a punishment for students, teachers, or even the school, they are assessment tools. Without them, we simply cannot measure progress and we cannot have accountability.

Yet, some have raised concerns about the tests in their own States. To the extent there are problems such as low standards and cheating, they should be addressed.

That said, I firmly believe that these concerns should not call into question the need to measure progress. I hope we will focus on our attention on how best to use these tests to enhance student achievement.

H.R. 1 also requires each State to sample students in fourth and eighth grade with the National Assessment for Education Progress, or another independent test of the State's choosing, to confirm the results of the State's assessments. Since the standards and assessments are developed at the State level, I believe a national measure is critical to help the public monitor the quality of standards and assessments in various States.

Currently, NAEP is the only test that will allow comparison between States and student groups, and is the best barometer of student achievement. Most Members of Congress use NAEP data to demonstrate our Nation's education failures. While I feel the need to preserve the balance of the agreement, I hope to work with my colleagues to better inform them about NAEP and to ensure that we do not inadvertently promote low standards students with other independent assessments.

Let me state unequivocally that any effort to strike or weaken the test provisions of the H.R. 1 would play into the hands of the keepers of the status quo, effectively preserving a failed system that does not ask if children are learning. A vote against testing would strike at the heart of President Bush's accountability system. I urge all Members to oppose any such amendment.

H.R. 1 also seeks to address the current lack of accountability for education failure. For our public schools, wherein 90 percent of our children are educated, we provide Federal dollars

and technical support as soon as they begin to fail. Yet, after time and assistance, H.R. 1 recognizes that some schools, by virtue of mismanagement or chronic neglect, have not only failed to increase student achievement but have actually retarded educational progress. For these schools, we require a substantial restructuring.

More importantly, we give the children a chance to learn by allowing them to immediately transfer to another, better-performing public or charter school. In addition, we allow students to take their share of Title I dollars to a private entity for tutoring or remediation services to ensure that they get the help that they need.

Finally, H.R. 1 grants new flexibility to States and local school districts, and vests additional power in the hands of practitioners, not bureaucrats.

I urge everyone to support this legislation and to oppose the testing amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), a member of the Committee.

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak for a moment about H.R. 1, which I consider to be a good bill, but one which could be even better.

There are two notable omissions from this bill: a freestanding effort to reduce class size, and a freestanding effort to build new schools or to repair crumbling schools.

Class size reduction efforts are included in this bill, but they compete, they compete with teacher quality and teacher training programs. I submit to the Members that no school, no parent, should have to choose between having a quality teacher and a small class size, which promotes learning and teaching. This is the only way that we can truly leave no child left behind.

Many Members know that many parents choose to send their children to private school substantially in part to get the benefits of smaller class size. But all children should have the benefit of this kind of education, a small class and a quality teacher.

Small class size, reducing class size, was a freestanding effort lost in the Senate by 50 to 48, and we were not permitted to bring that amendment to this floor. I urge the conferees to restore the freestanding program in the conference committee.

This program has fallen victim to politics associated with the Clinton administration. I think that is extremely unfortunate, because this is not a Clinton idea, this is a commonsense idea, one which benefits all children across America, and we should restore it to this bill any way we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) will reclaim his time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I also thank him for good service as the chairman of the committee on a very difficult bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not only thankful for his service, and that of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member, but I am also thankful that we have a good President who supports improving education, and supports it not just because it is a major campaign issue, but supports it from his heart. He also understands the appropriate Federal role, and his work on this reflects that.

We need flexibility and accountability. We need respect for local and State rights and responsibilities. Again, I say that from my heart, because I have served in local, State, and Federal government. This bill provides that flexibility. It also provides that accountability. I urge this body to vote for that bill.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in education extends back many years. I served for 22 years as a professor at the University of California at Berkeley and at Calvin College. My interest in this bill's particular aspect of education developed some 36 years ago when I became involved in working with teachers in elementary schools, trying to improve science education.

This arose very naturally from my background as a scientist. I have taught National Science Foundation summer institutes for elementary school teachers. I have worked in schools with the teachers and the students. I believe I have a good understanding of the issue.

I think it is extremely important that we improve our science education in this Nation, not just because I am a scientist, but because that is where the jobs of the future are. We currently have over 300,000 open jobs in this Nation for scientists, engineers, technicians, and those jobs are not being filled because we are not training the people.

This bill will help to train our children so they will qualify for those jobs in the future. I think that is an extremely important aspect of the bill. But we do have to strengthen the bill a bit because, although the bill asks States to set standards for science, it does not require assessments of student's learning of science.

We hope to take care of that problem in a colloquy which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and I will engage in in just a moment. The Senate has included science assessments in their bill. We had it in the original bill. It unfortunately is not in the current bill before us, but we are hoping through the colloquy to make sure that is in the bill when it reaches the House for consideration of the conference report.

Let me also make one last comment about "Leaving no child behind." I believe that it is very important to apply